

## United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/734,379	12/12/2003	Rishikesh K. Bharadwaj	AVERP3071USA	9764
7590 10/05/2004			EXAMINER	
Heidi A. Boehlefeld			LECHERT JR, STEPHEN J	
Renner, Otto, B	Boisselle & Sklar, LLP			
Nineteenth Floor			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
1621 Euclid Avenue			1732	
Cleveland, OH	44115-2191			

DATE MAILED: 10/05/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

		Application No.	Applicant(s)		
		10/734,379	BHARADWAJ ET AL. \		
Office Action Summary		Examiner	Art Unit		
		Stephen J. Lechert Jr.	1732		
Period fo	The MAILING DATE of this communication app or Reply	ears on the cover sheet w	ith the correspondence address		
A SH THE - Exte after - If the	MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION. Insions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.1 SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. The period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply	36(a). In no event, however, may a r	eply be timely filed  by (30) days will be considered timely		
- Failt Any	Deriod for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period vare to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing ed patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	cause the application to become AF	BANDONED (35 U.S.C. & 133)		
Status					
1) 🛛	Responsive to communication(s) filed on 12 D	ecember 2003.			
2a)□		action is non-final.			
3)	Since this application is in condition for allowar	nce except for formal matt	ers, prosecution as to the ments is		
	closed in accordance with the practice under E		•		
Disposit	ion of Claims				
l	Claim(s) 1-33 is/are pending in the application.				
1	4a) Of the above claim(s) <u>1-10</u> is/are withdrawr				
1	5) Claim(s) is/are allowed.				
l	Claim(s) <u>11-33</u> is/are rejected.				
7)	Claim(s) is/are objected to.				
8)	Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/o	election requirement.			
Applicati	ion Papers				
9)	The specification is objected to by the Examine	r.			
1	The drawing(s) filed on 12 December 2003 is/a		objected to by the Examiner		
	Applicant may not request that any objection to the				
	Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correct		* *		
11)	The oath or declaration is objected to by the Ex				
Priority u	ınder 35 U.S.C. § 119				
	Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign	nriority under 35 U.S.C. &	110(a) (d) or (f)		
1	☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:	priority under 55 O.S.C. §	119(a)-(u) 01 (1).		
	1. Certified copies of the priority documents	have been received	•		
ĺ	2. Certified copies of the priority documents		onlication No		
	3. Copies of the certified copies of the prior				
	application from the International Bureau		or a substantial orago		
* s	see the attached detailed Office action for a list of		received.		
Attachment		_			
1) X Notice	e of References Cited (PTO-892) e of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)	4) Interview S	ummary (PTO-413) /Mail Date		
3) 🛛 Inform	nation Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)	5) 🔲 Notice of In	formal Patent Application (PTO-152)		
	No(s)/Mail Date <u>3-22-04, 524-04</u> .	6) Other:			
U.S. Patent and Tra PTOL-326 (Re		ion Summary	Part of Paper No./Mail Date 20040930		

Application/Control Number: 10/734,379 Page 2

**Art Unit: 1732** 

Restriction to one of the following inventions is required under 35
 U.S.C. 121:

- I. Claims 1-10, drawn to an embossed oriented film, classified in class 428, subclass 156.
- II. Claims 11-33, drawn to a method of embossing an optical sheet, classified in class 264, subclass 293.

The inventions are distinct, each from the other because of the following reasons:

- 2. Inventions II and I are related as process and apparatus for its practice. The inventions are distinct if it can be shown that either: (1) the process as claimed can be practiced by another materially different apparatus or by hand, or (2) the apparatus as claimed can be used to practice another and materially different process. (MPEP § 806.05(e)). In this case the embossed film of the group I claims could be made a materially different process such as etching.
- 3. Because these inventions are distinct for the reasons given above and have acquired a separate status in the art as shown by their

Page 3

**Art Unit: 1732** 

different classification, restriction for examination purposes as indicated is proper.

- 4. Because these inventions are distinct for the reasons given above and have acquired a separate status in the art because of their recognized divergent subject matter, restriction for examination purposes as indicated is proper.
- 5. During a telephone conversation with applicant's representative on September 27, 2004 a provisional election was made with traverse to prosecute the invention of Group II, claims 11-33. Affirmation of this election must be made by applicant in replying to this Office action. Claims 1-10 have been withdrawn from further consideration by the examiner, 37 CFR 1.142(b), as being drawn to a non-elected invention.

6.

7. Applicant is reminded that upon the cancellation of claims to a non-elected invention, the inventorship must be amended in compliance with 37 CFR 1.48(b) if one or more of the currently named

Page 4

Application/Control Number: 10/734,379

Art Unit: 1732

inventors is no longer an inventor of at least one claim remaining in the application. Any amendment of inventorship must be accompanied by a request under 37 CFR 1.48(b) and by the fee required under 37 CFR 1.17(i).

- 8. Action on the merits of claims 11-33 follows:
- 9. The nonstatutory double patenting rejection is based on a judicially created doctrine grounded in public policy (a policy reflected in the statute) so as to prevent the unjustified or improper timewise extension of the "right to exclude" granted by a patent and to prevent possible harassment by multiple assignees. See *In re Goodman*, 11 F.3d 1046, 29 USPQ2d 2010 (Fed. Cir. 1993); *In re Longi*, 759 F.2d 887, 225 USPQ 645 (Fed. Cir. 1985); *In re Van Ornum*, 686 F.2d 937, 214 USPQ 761 (CCPA 1982); *In re Vogel*, 422 F.2d 438, 164 USPQ 619 (CCPA 1970);and, *In re Thorington*, 418 F.2d 528, 163 USPQ 644 (CCPA 1969).

A timely filed terminal disclaimer in compliance with 37 CFR 1.321(c) may be used to overcome an actual or provisional rejection based on a nonstatutory double patenting ground provided the conflicting application or patent is shown to be commonly owned with this application. See 37 CFR 1.130(b).

Effective January 1, 1994, a registered attorney or agent of record may sign a terminal disclaimer. A terminal disclaimer signed by the assignee must fully comply with 37 CFR 3.73(b).

10. Claims 11-33 are provisionally rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1-48 and 60-65 of copending Application No. 10/634,104. Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are

**Application/Control Number: 10/734,379** 

**Art Unit: 1732** 

not patentably distinct from each other because both applications claim a method of patterning or embossing a sheet material using patterned tool which is pressed against a sheet, while maintaining the pressure, radiantly heating the sheet using near infrared radiant energy from a radiant energy source and wherein the radiant heating includes passing the radiant energy through a relatively radiantly transparent material in contact with the sheet. In the instant case, these claims are narrower in scope than the '104 application, because the sheet used in the instant case, is claim as an anisotropic uniaxially oriented polymer sheet whereas in the '104 application the sheet had it is maintained that although the instant application is more specific, the instant applicant is encompassed the broad recitation of "sheet" in the '104 application thus being an obvious selection of sheet material.

This is a <u>provisional</u> obviousness-type double patenting rejection because the conflicting claims have not in fact been patented.

11. With a timely filed and properly executed Terminal Disclaimer, this case would be in condition for allowance as the method as

Application/Control Number: 10/734,379 Page 6

**Art Unit: 1732** 

claimed has not been taught either singularly or in combination by the prior art.

12. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure. Wisotzky et al. and Chirhart et al. both teach embossing or patterning a sheet material using infrared heating but do not teach the concept of using near-infrared heating.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Stephen J. Lechert Jr. whose telephone number is 571-272-1203. The examiner can normally be reached on 9:30-6:00.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Michael P. Colaianni can be reached on 571-272-1196. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

**Art Unit: 1732** 

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Stephen J. Lechert Jr.

**Primary Examiner** 

Art Unit 1732